



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/735,615      | 12/16/2003  | Young Ho Park        | 2336-229            | 2726             |

7590 09/10/2004

LOWE HAUPTMAN GILMAN & BERNER, LLP  
Suite 310  
1700 Diagonal Road  
Alexandria, VA 22314

EXAMINER

SARKAR, ASOK K

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|
| 2829     |              |

DATE MAILED: 09/10/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|                              |                                      |                                    |  |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|
| <b>Office Action Summary</b> | <b>Application No.</b><br>10/735,615 | <b>Applicant(s)</b><br>PARK ET AL. |  |
|                              | <b>Examiner</b><br>Asok K. Sarkar    | <b>Art Unit</b><br>2829            |  |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 December 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 6-8 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 5 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12/16/2003 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>12/16/2003</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Drawings*

1. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference character(s) mentioned in the description: The reference numeral 23 in page 4, line 21 is not shown in Fig. 1. Corrected drawing sheets are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.
2. Figure 2 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g). Corrected drawing sheets are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

5. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6. Claims 1 – 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoo, US 2003/0077847 in view of the Admitted Prior Art (APA).

Regarding claim 1, Yoo teaches a method for manufacturing a gallium nitride-

based semiconductor light emitting device, comprising the steps of:

- sequentially forming, over substrate, first conductivity type clad layer 140, an active layer 160, and second conductivity type clad layer 180 (see Fig. 3C);
- forming a transparent electrode 220 over the second conductivity type clad layer 180 (see Fig. 3C);  
forming the transparent electrode such that the transparent electrode is exposed at predetermined region corresponding one lateral end portion thereof (see Fig. 3C);
- removing respective portions of the transparent electrode 220, second conductivity type clad layer 180, and active layer 160 corresponding to the predetermined region, thereby partially exposing the first conductivity type clad layer 140 (see Fig. 3C) ;
- and forming first 260 and second bonding electrodes 250 on predetermined portions of the transparent electrode and second conductivity type clad layer, respectively.

Yoo fails to teach forming a photoresist film on the transparent electrode for etching the respective portions of the different layers as shown in Fig. 3C and removing the photoresist film.

The APA teaches etching the different layers of a GaN LED device using a photoresist film and removing the film afterwards for the benefit of forming ohmic contact layers to the LED device with respect to Figs 1 in pages 2 – 4.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Yoo and form the photoresist film on the transparent electrode for etching the respective portions of the different layers and then removing the photoresist film to complete the device formation for the benefit of forming ohmic contact layers to the LED device as taught by the APA in pages 2 – 4.

Regarding claim 2, Yoo in view of the APA fails to teach the wet etching of the transparent electrode and the dry etching of the clad layer and the active layer.

However, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Yoo and wet etch the transparent electrode and dry etch the clad layer and the active layer since wet etching and dry etching are conventional etching processes in the semiconductor industry.

Regarding claims 3 and 4, Yoo fails to teach the step of undercutting the transparent electrode by over etching with the width of 3 micron.

The APA teaches the formation of the transparent electrode 18 the width of which is slightly smaller than the width of the second cladding layer with reference to Fig 1 (e) for the benefit of forming ohmic contact layers to the LED device in page 4.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Yoo and form the transparent electrode with width slightly smaller than the width of the second cladding layer for the benefit of forming ohmic contact layers to the LED device as taught by the APA in page 4. It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Yoo and

Art Unit: 2829

form the transparent electrode with an undercut width of 3 micron as a design choice since the purpose of the undercut is to facilitate static discharge.

Note that the specification contains no disclosure of either the critical nature of the claimed processes or any unexpected results arising therefrom. Where patentability is said to be based upon particular chosen methods or upon another variable recited in a claim, the Applicant must show that the chosen methods or variables are critical (*Woodruff*, 919 F.2d 1575, 1578, 16 USPQ2d 1934, 1936 (Fed. Cir., 1990)). See also *In re Aller, Lacey and Hall* (10 USPQ 233 – 237).

### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

7. Claims 6 – 8 are allowed.
8. Claim 5 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
9. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

Claims 6 – 8 recite, inter alia, a method of manufacturing a GaN – based LED device in which the passivation layer is etched to expose electrode forming regions on the device and form the bonding electrodes for the device in these regions. The art of record does not disclose or anticipate the above limitation in combination with other claim elements nor would it be obvious to modify the art of record so as to form a device including the above limitation.

### ***Conclusion***

Art Unit: 2829

10. Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Asok K. Sarkar whose telephone number is 571 272 1970. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday (8 AM- 5 PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Tokar can be reached on 571 272 1812. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

12. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

*Asok Kumar Sarkar*

Asok K. Sarkar  
August 26, 2004

Patent Examiner